

**To:** Herberich, Jim (Jim.Herberich@aecom.com)[Jim.Herberich@aecom.com]  
**Cc:** LaPoma, Jennifer[LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Tsang, Frank[TsangC@cdmsmith.com]; Puckett, Katherine A.[puckettka@cdmsmith.com]  
**From:** Kirchner, Scott  
**Sent:** Tue 6/3/2014 11:39:26 AM  
**Subject:** FW: Low Resolution Core 2012---a couple of questions

Jim, please see the questions below regarding the SSP2 dataset.

For the first question: It appears that the majority of the odd qualifier codes are related to lab QC results which I understand you do not validate so you accept the lab qualifier as the interpreted qualifier. It seems in this set of data the laboratories got very creative with their qualifiers so we will need a listing of the qualifier codes and their meaning. Please confirm my understanding of the dataset and provide the listing of qualifier codes.

The second question regarding dry versus wet weight basis: I need to confirm that all the sediment results are presented on a dry weight basis.

Thanks

Scott F Kirchner

-----Original Message-----

From: Jay Field [mailto:jay.field@noaa.gov]  
Sent: Monday, June 02, 2014 7:30 PM  
To: Kirchner, Scott  
Cc: Reyhan Mehran; LaPoma, Jennifer  
Subject: Low Resolution Core 2012---a couple of questions

Scott,

Qualifier codes: There are a few qualifier descriptions that we were not able to define based on prior CPG deliveries, including: G, A, T; also, can you confirm that codes such as "EST AP" are a concatenation of five codes (e.g., E, S, T, A, P).

Measurement basis: All of the data are reported in DW, except for PCB congener and dioxin/furan results from the 'APER' lab that notes a basis of "NA" --- is it safe to assume these are also dry weight?

thanks,  
Jay